

1 WO  
2  
3  
4  
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8  
9 Damian Hart, et al. ) No. CV-77-0479-PHX-NVW  
10 Plaintiff, )  
11 vs. )  
12 Tom Agnos, et al. )  
13 Defendant. )  
14 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
15 )  
16

17 The court has reviewed Defendants' Notice of Filing (doc. # 1235), Plaintiffs'  
18 Request for Status Conference (doc. #1237), and Plaintiffs' Fifth Pending Motions  
19 Notification (doc. #1210). Pending before the court are the following motions:

- 20     • Defendants' Renewed Motion to Terminate (doc. #906);  
21     • Plaintiffs' Omnibus Motion (doc. #1142);  
22     • Motion to Compel Production of Documents (doc. #1165);  
23     • Motion for Sanctions Against Defendants and Their Counsel (doc. #1178);  
24     • Plaintiff's Motion for Oral Argument on Motion to Compel (doc. #1179);  
25     • Plaintiffs' Request for Status Conference (doc. #1180);  
26     • Motion to Compel Supplemental Responses to First Request for Production of  
27         Document (doc. #1181);  
28

- 1       • Plaintiffs' Motion to Refer Discovery Matters to Magistrate Judge (doc.  
2                   #1184);  
3       • Motion to Expedite Consideration of Motion for Appointment of Class  
4                   Counsel and Consideration of All Pending Motions (doc. #1213);  
5       • Plaintiffs' Motion for Prior Notice and Other Procedural Safeguards in the  
6                   Event of a Court Viewing of the Maricopa County Jail Premises (doc. #1214);  
7       • Defendants' Motion to Strike (doc. #1224);  
8       • Plaintiffs' Request for Status Conference (doc. #1237).

9 The court will rule upon all of the motions and requests identified above except for  
10 Defendants' Renewed Motion to Terminate (doc. #906), order the parties to meet and  
11 prepare a joint Case Management Report, order a Case Management Conference, order a  
12 Final Pre-Hearing Conference, and set an evidentiary hearing date of **August 12, 2008**.

### 13 I. Rulings on Pending Motions

#### 14 A. Motion to Expedite Consideration of Motion for Appointment of Class 15                   Counsel and Consideration of All Pending Motions (Doc. #1213)

16       On April 1, 2008, Judge Earl H. Carroll appointed Debra Hill of Osborn Maledon,  
17 P.A., and Margaret Winter of the ACLU National Prison Project to be counsel for the  
18 Plaintiffs' class. (Doc. #1221.) On April 8, 2008, Defendants moved the court to  
19 reconsider the appointment Order. (Doc. #1231.) Following transfer of the case to this  
20 court on April 10, 2008 (doc. #1234), the court treated Defendants' motion for  
21 reconsideration as a response, considered Defendants' arguments, denied the motion in all  
22 other respects, and reaffirmed the appointment Order on April 16, 2008. (Doc. #1239.)  
23 Plaintiffs' request for an order expediting briefing on class counsel appointment therefore  
24 is now moot.

25       The court agrees with Plaintiffs that all pending motions must be resolved  
26 promptly. For many of these motions, however, it is much too late to refer to their  
27 resolution now as "expedited." The court will resolve all pending motions either by this  
28

1 Order or according to the process and schedule outlined below. The court therefore will  
2 deny Plaintiffs' motion to expedite as moot.

3       **B. Plaintiffs' Motion for Prior Notice and Other Procedural Safeguards in  
4 the Event of a Court Viewing of the Maricopa County Jail Premises (Doc.  
#1214)**

5       The court will deny as moot Plaintiffs' motion regarding a court viewing of the  
6 Maricopa County Jail, which was based upon comments by Judge Carroll that he might  
7 visit the jail without prior notice to the parties. The court will be deciding this case as the  
8 trier of fact governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Federal Rules of  
9 Evidence. In the event it becomes necessary for the court to conduct a portion of an  
10 evidentiary hearing at any of the Maricopa County Jail facilities, the court will so direct in  
11 its pre-hearing orders.

12       **C. Defendants' Motion to Strike (Doc. #1224) Letter from Terry Peltz (Doc.  
13 #1211)**

14       Defendants move to strike a letter sent to Judge Carroll from Terry Peltz (doc.  
15 #1211). The court will grant Defendants' motion (doc. #1224) because Mr. Peltz has not  
16 been joined as an individual party, and if he is a member of Plaintiffs' class, he should be  
17 communicating to the court only through class counsel.

18       **D. Plaintiffs' Motion to Refer Discovery Matters to Magistrate Judge (Doc.  
#1184)**

19       The court has reviewed Plaintiffs' motion to refer discovery matters to a magistrate  
20 judge (doc. #1184) and Defendants' response (doc. #1185). The court will decline to  
21 refer discovery matters to a magistrate judge to ensure prompt resolution of all issues  
22 impeding final resolution of this case.

23       **E. Plaintiffs' Omnibus Motion (Doc. #1142) and Discovery Motions**

24       Plaintiffs' Omnibus Motion asks the court to: (1) appoint a health care expert and  
25 an environmental health and safety expert under Fed. R. Evid. 706 to investigate current  
26 conditions; (2) compel Defendants to permit Plaintiffs' mental health and corrections  
27 experts to inspect the Jail; and (3) compel the Defendants to produce a number of relevant  
28 documents. (Doc. #1142 at 2.) In addition, Plaintiffs have filed a Motion to Compel

1 Production of Documents (doc. #1165); Motion for Sanctions Against Defendants and  
2 Their Counsel (doc. #1178); Plaintiff's Motion for Oral Argument on Motion to Compel  
3 (doc. #1179); and Motion to Compel Supplemental Responses to First Request for  
4 Production of Document (doc. #1181). The parties also have filed an Amended  
5 Stipulation for Protective Order (doc. #1169), which has not yet been approved and  
6 ordered by the court. The parties dispute, as threshold issues, which party bears the  
7 burden of proof, what is the relevant time period for proving the "current and ongoing  
8 violation of the Federal right" for termination of the Amended Judgment under 18 U.S.C.  
9 § 3626(b), whether an evidentiary hearing is required, and whether the Amended  
10 Judgment is automatically stayed under 18 U.S.C. § 3626(e).

11           **1. Burden of Proof, Relevant Time Period, Need for Evidentiary  
12           Hearing, and PLRA Automatic Stay**

13           This 1977 class action against Maricopa County and the Maricopa County  
14 Sheriff's Office regarding jail conditions for pretrial detainees resulted in the January 10,  
15 1995 entry of the Amended Judgment, a consent decree negotiated by the parties that  
16 expressly did not represent a judicial determination of any constitutionally mandated  
17 standards applicable to the jails. (Doc. #705 at 2, ¶ 2.) Pursuant to the Prison Litigation  
18 Reform Act ("PLRA"), 18 U.S.C. § 3626 and 42 U.S.C. § 1997e, Defendants filed a  
19 motion to terminate the Amended Judgment in 1998 (doc. #755) and later renewed their  
20 motion to terminate on September 25, 2001 (doc. #821). On September 12, 2002, Judge  
21 Carroll denied Defendants' motion to terminate without prejudice subject to findings to  
22 be entered following an evidentiary hearing. (Doc. #840.) On November 14, 2003,  
23 Defendants filed a pre-hearing memorandum in support of a renewed motion to terminate,  
24 which operates as Defendants' current motion to terminate the Amended Judgment.  
25 (Doc. #906.) The parties raise the following threshold issues in the pending motions:

26           a. Status of Amended Judgment. The PLRA provides that any order for  
27 prospective relief regarding prison conditions is *terminable*, not terminated, upon the  
28 motion of any party or intervener two years after the court granted or approved the

1 prospective relief, one year after the court has entered an order denying termination of  
2 prospective relief under the PLRA, or two years after the enactment of the PLRA for  
3 previous orders. 18 U.S.C. § 3626(b)(1). Subsection (b)(2) provides the defendant or  
4 intervenor shall be entitled to “immediate” termination, regardless of when the order was  
5 issued, but “a district court cannot terminate prospective relief without determining  
6 whether the existing relief (in whole or in part) exceeds the constitutional minimum.”  
7 *Gilmore v. California*, 220 F.3d 987, 1007 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000). The statute limits the scope of  
8 federal jurisdiction to enforce the prospective aspect of final judgments in prison  
9 conditions cases, but it does not require the termination of consent decrees or other final  
10 judgments. *Id.* at 1001. The PLRA, therefore, is not self-executing. A judge must decide  
11 which, if any, provisions of the Amended Judgment must be terminated under the statute.

12 Further, although subsection (b)(2) provides for immediate termination of any  
13 prospective relief if the relief was approved or granted in the absence of certain findings,  
14 it is not necessary that the explicit findings were made, “so long as the record, the court’s  
15 decision ordering prospective relief, and the relevant caselaw fairly disclose that the relief  
16 actually meets the § 3626(b)(2) narrow tailoring standard.” *Gilmore*, 220 F.3d at 1007  
17 n.25. “If existing relief was so crafted according to the record and relevant caselaw, the  
18 findings required by the statute are implicit in the court’s judgment.” *Id.*

19 b. PLRA Automatic Stay. The PLRA requires the court to “promptly rule on any  
20 motion to modify or terminate prospective relief in a civil action with respect to prison  
21 conditions.” 18 U.S.C. § 3626(e)(1). The motion will automatically operate as a stay  
22 beginning thirty days after it is filed, and the court may postpone the effective date of an  
23 automatic stay for good cause for not more than sixty additional days. 18 U.S.C.  
24 § 3626(e)(2) & (3). “Once the 90-day period has passed, the § 3626(b) motion ‘shall  
25 operate as a stay’ until the court rules on the § 3626(b) motion.” *Miller v. French*, 530

26

27

28

1 U.S. 327, 340 (2000). Thus, the prospective relief granted in the Amended Judgment is  
 2 stayed and has been since at least 2003.<sup>1</sup>

3       c. Burden of Proof. Defendants bear the burden of proving their motion to  
 4 terminate the Amended Judgment. Under the PLRA, a defendant “shall be entitled to the  
 5 immediate termination of any prospective relief if the relief was approved or granted in  
 6 the absence of a finding by the court that the relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further  
 7 than necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right, and is the least intrusive means  
 8 necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right.” 18 U.S.C. § 3626(b)(2).  
 9 However, subsection (b)(2) is limited by subsection (b)(3): “Prospective relief shall not  
 10 terminate if the court makes written findings based on the record that prospective relief  
 11 remains necessary to correct a current and ongoing violation of the Federal right, extends  
 12 no further than necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right, and that the  
 13 prospective relief is narrowly drawn and the least intrusive means to correct the  
 14 violation.” 18 U.S.C. § 3626(b)(3).

15       Under the PLRA termination provisions, the party seeking to terminate the  
 16 prospective relief bears the burden of proving, with “careful application of law to fact,”  
 17 that the relief ordered exceeds the constitutional minimum:

18       First, nothing in the termination provisions can be said to shift the burden of  
 19 proof from the party seeking to terminate the prospective relief. Second,  
 20 and more importantly, although § 3626(b)(2) speaks of ‘immediate  
 21 termination,’ and although § 3626(e)(1) requires a ‘prompt’ ruling, a district  
 22 court cannot terminate prospective relief without determining whether the  
 23 existing relief (in whole or in part) exceeds the constitutional minimum.  
 24 And, consistent with § 3626(b)(3), a district court cannot terminate or  
 25 refuse to grant prospective relief necessary to correct a current and ongoing  
 26 violation, so long as the relief is tailored to the constitutional minimum.  
 27 Thus, unless plaintiffs do not contest defendants’ showing that there is no  
 28 current and ongoing violation under § 3626(b)(3), the court must inquire  
 into current conditions at a prison before ruling on a motion to terminate. If  
 the existing relief qualifies for termination under § 3626(b)(2), but there is a

---

26       <sup>1</sup> Judge Carroll’s April 1, 2008 Order that Defendants produce reports specified in the  
 27 Amended Judgment within thirty days of the Order expressly does so to facilitate discovery  
 28 and resolution of Defendants’ termination motion and not to enforce the Amended Judgment  
 itself. (Doc. #1220.)

1 current and ongoing violation, the district court will have to modify the  
 2 relief to meet the Act's standards. It is plain that each of these steps  
 3 requires real adjudication—the careful application of law to fact—not the  
 4 wooden ratification of a legislatively prescribed conclusion.

5 *Gilmore v. California*, 220 F.3d 987, 1007-08 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000) (footnote omitted). Thus,  
 6 Defendants bear the burden of proving both (1) prospective relief granted by the  
 7 Amended Judgment exceeds the constitutional minimum and (2) prospective relief is not  
 8 necessary to correct a current and ongoing violation of pretrial detainees' constitutional  
 9 rights. Both Defendants and Plaintiffs must disclose information they intend to offer at  
 10 the evidentiary hearing by dates that will be established in a Case Management Order.

11 d. Relevant Time Period and Need for Evidentiary Hearing. To make the  
 12 findings required to terminate prospective relief, the court must take evidence on current  
 13 jail conditions, at least with respect to those remedies Plaintiffs do not concede  
 14 Defendants are in compliance with constitutional requirements. *See Gilmore*, 220 F.3d at  
 15 1010. Evidence of "current and ongoing" violations must reflect conditions "as of the  
 16 time termination is sought." *Id.*; *accord Pierce v. Orange County*, \_\_ F.3d \_\_, 2008 WL  
 17 762072 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. Mar. 24, 2008) (PLRA termination standard requires assessment of the  
 18 legal and factual circumstances at the time termination is sought). Although Defendants  
 19 have been seeking termination since 1998, the court's findings must be based on current  
 20 evidence. Therefore, the court concludes that an evidentiary hearing is necessary to make  
 21 findings based on a current record. The court will hold the evidentiary hearing beginning  
 22 August 12, 2008, and the court will order the parties to jointly plan for appropriate  
 23 discovery regarding jail conditions during the period of July 1, 2007, through June 30,  
 24 2008.

## 25           **2. Rule 706 Experts**

26           In their Omnibus Motion Plaintiffs move for appointment of a health care expert  
 27 and an environmental health and safety expert pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 706. (Doc.  
 28 #1142.) Rule 706 permits the court to appoint expert witnesses to perform duties directed  
 by the court and to order that the witnesses be compensated by the parties in such

1 proportion and at such time as the court directs. Nothing in the rule limits parties in  
 2 calling expert witnesses of their own selection. Fed. R. Civ. P. 706(d).

3 Courts do not commonly appoint an expert pursuant to Rule 706 and usually do so  
 4 only in “exceptional cases in which the ordinary adversary process does not suffice” or  
 5 when a case presents compelling circumstances warranting appointment of an expert. *In*  
 6 *re Joint E. & S. Dists. Asbestos Litigation*, 830 F. Supp. 686, 693 (E.D.N.Y. 1993);  
 7 *Carranza v. Fraas*, 471 F. Supp. 2d 8, 9 (D.D.C. 2007). Plaintiffs have made no showing  
 8 that the evidence or claims here are so complex that the appointment of a court expert is  
 9 necessary or that this case presents compelling circumstances warranting the appointment  
 10 of experts. *See Carranza*, 471 F. Supp. 2d at 10; *Ledford v. Sullivan*, 105 F.3d 354, 358-  
 11 59 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997) (district court did not abuse its discretion by denying request to appoint  
 12 expert under Rule 706 where factual issues were not so complicated that an expert was  
 13 required); *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. United States*, 640 F.2d 328, 334-35 (Ct. Cl. 1980)  
 14 (trial judge did not abuse its discretion by denying appointment of experts where judge  
 15 concluded additional experts would not serve to elucidate, clarify, or enlighten him, but  
 16 instead would add more divergence and opinion differences in a cumulative manner).  
 17 The court, therefore, will deny the portion of Plaintiffs’ Omnibus Motion requesting  
 18 appointment of Rule 706 experts.

### 19           **3. Plaintiffs’ Experts’ Opportunity to Inspect**

20           The court will grant in part the portion of Plaintiffs’ Omnibus Motion requesting  
 21 the court to compel Defendants to permit Plaintiffs’ experts to inspect Maricopa County  
 22 Jail facilities, but the court will issue specific orders regarding expert inspections as part  
 23 of the Case Management Order to issue following the Case Management Conference. As  
 24 directed below, the court will order the parties to include in their joint Case Management  
 25 Report proposed terms for these inspections.

### 26           **4. Plaintiffs’ Request for Scheduling Order Providing Six-Month 27           Discovery Period and Resumed Evidentiary Hearing**

28

1       The court will grant Plaintiffs' request for a scheduling order, which will issue  
 2 after the court has received the parties' joint Case Management Report ordered below and  
 3 held the Case Management Conference with the parties. The court will deny Plaintiffs'  
 4 request for a six-month discovery period and a resumed evidentiary hearing.

5       Having determined that the relevant time period for evidence of "current and  
 6 ongoing" constitutional violations is July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, the court finds  
 7 that evidence presented in November 2003 and January 2004 cannot be assumed to be  
 8 relevant. Therefore, the court will not "resume" the 2003-2004 evidentiary hearing, but  
 9 instead will hold a new evidentiary hearing on **August 12, 2008**. If a party wishes to  
 10 offer evidence in the 2008 hearing that was presented during the unfinished 2003-2004  
 11 evidentiary hearing, the offering party must prove its relevance and admissibility.

12       The discovery period will be less than six months. The PLRA plainly conveys  
 13 congressional intent that termination of prospective relief regarding prison conditions be  
 14 decided swiftly by referring to termination as "immediate," requiring the court to rule  
 15 "promptly," and providing mandamus to remedy any failure to issue a prompt ruling on a  
 16 termination motion. 18 U.S.C. § 3626(b)(2), (b)(3), & (e)(1). Further, the statute's thirty-  
 17 day period before a termination motion automatically stays prospective relief indicates  
 18 Congress intended that this "prompt" and "immediate" ruling be made within thirty days  
 19 in most cases. *See id.* at § 3626(e)(2)(A)(i). The statute permits the court to postpone the  
 20 effective date of the automatic stay for an additional sixty days, but only for good cause,  
 21 and not because of general congestion of the court's calendar. *Id.* at § 3626(e)(3); *see also Miller*, 530 U.S. at 350 ("Through the PLRA, Congress clearly intended to make  
 23 operation of the automatic stay mandatory, precluding courts from exercising their  
 24 equitable powers to enjoin the stay."). The court, therefore, will order the parties to  
 25 propose a case management plan that includes discovery ending in time for the parties to  
 26 prepare for the August 12, 2008 evidentiary hearing.

27                   **5. Discovery Motions and Stipulated Protective Order**

28

1       In their Omnibus Motion filed May 30, 2006, Plaintiffs requested that Defendants  
2 be compelled to produce documents requested in April 2004, but state that in March 2006  
3 they limited their requests to recent years. (Doc. #1142 at 5 & n.5.) Two of the  
4 categories of documents are reports required by the Amended Judgment. (Doc. #1142-2,  
5 Exh. B.) On April 1, 2008, Judge Carroll ordered that Defendants produce within thirty  
6 days reports specified in the Amended Judgment to the extent not previously provided.  
7 (Doc. #1220.)

8       In addition, Plaintiffs filed a Motion to Compel Production of Documents on  
9 October 10, 2006 (doc. #1165), a Motion for Sanctions Against Defendants and Their  
10 Counsel on November 21, 2006 (doc. #1178), and a Motion to Compel Supplemental  
11 Responses to First Request for Production of Document on November 30, 2006 (doc.  
12 #1181). Regarding these motions, the parties have disputed issues that are clarified by  
13 this Order, *e.g.*, the relevant time period for evidence of “current” jail conditions, and  
14 other issues that now are moot, *e.g.*, their obligations under Magistrate Judge Sitver’s  
15 September 30, 2005 Order (doc. #1105) and subsequent orders to stay (doc. #1120) and  
16 then lift the stay on Judge Sitver’s Order on September 29, 2006 (doc. #1164).  
17 Moreover, it is unclear how Plaintiffs would have been able to identify specific areas of  
18 current constitutional concern taking into account the opening of new jails in 2005 before  
19 they had obtained discovery regarding jail conditions in 2005 and how Defendants could  
20 produce confidential documents before a protective order was entered. Further, Plaintiffs  
21 acknowledged that they no longer needed information for some of the years requested.  
22 When the parties prepare their joint Case Management Report, in light of the court’s  
23 rulings in this Order, the parties will be better able to determine what, if any, of the  
24 discovery requested in 2006 remains outstanding and relevant. As part of their discovery  
25 planning, the parties are directed to review the Amended Stipulation of the Parties for a  
26 Protective Order (doc. #1169), revise as appropriate, and file a new stipulation and  
27  
28

1 proposed protective order for the court's approval.<sup>2</sup> The court, therefore, will deny  
 2 Plaintiffs' three discovery motions (docs. ##1165, 1178, 1181), their requests for oral  
 3 argument (docs. ##1178, 1179), and the portions of the Omnibus Motion regarding  
 4 discovery (doc. #1142) without prejudice.

5 Because it is not apparent from these discovery motions that the parties have  
 6 consistently complied with LRCiv 7.2(j), the parties are reminded:

7 No discovery motion will be considered or decided unless a statement of  
 8 moving counsel is attached thereto certifying that after personal  
 9 consultation and sincere efforts to do so, counsel have been unable to  
 satisfactorily resolve the matter. Any discovery motion brought before the  
 Court without prior personal consultation with the other party and a sincere  
 effort to resolve the matter, may result in sanctions.

10 Personal consultation requires face-to-face communication, or at least telephone  
 11 communication. Letters, faxes, and e-mails are insufficient.

#### 12           **F. Plaintiffs' Requests for Status Conference (Docs. ##1180, 1237)**

13           The court will grant Plaintiffs' requests for status conference.

### 14           **II. Case Management**

#### 15           **A. Case Management Conference and Report**

16           A Case Management Conference will be set for **May 19, 2008, at 3:00 p.m.**, to  
 17 prepare for the August 12, 2008 evidentiary hearing on Defendants' Renewed Motion to  
 18 Terminate the Amended Judgment (doc. #906). Trial counsel who will be responsible for  
 19 representing each party at the evidentiary hearing shall appear and participate in the Case  
 20 Management Conference and shall have authority to enter into stipulations regarding all  
 21 matters that may be discussed. During or after the Case Management Conference, the  
 22 court will enter a Case Management Order.

23           In preparation for the Case Management Conference, the parties are directed to  
 24 meet and confer no later than **May 12, 2008**. It is the responsibility of Defendants, the  
 25 moving parties, to initiate the case management planning meeting and preparation of the

27           <sup>2</sup> It appears that Defendants have produced confidential documents under the terms  
 28 of the proposed protective order. (See doc. #1175.)

1 Case Management Report. The parties will exchange their written proposals for the Case  
2 Management Report **at least two business days** before the parties meet and confer. At  
3 this meeting the parties shall develop a joint Case Management Report that contains the  
4 following information in separately numbered paragraphs:

5       1. The parties who attended the case management planning meeting and assisted  
6 in developing the Case Management Report;

7       2. A brief description of “current and ongoing” jail conditions that Plaintiffs’  
8 allege, based on incomplete discovery, require prospective relief under the PLRA;

9       3. Identification of specific prospective relief provided by the Amended  
10 Judgment (with paragraph references) that Defendants contend are not enforceable under  
11 the PLRA and for each contention, a brief description of Defendants’ basis for the  
12 contention and whether Plaintiffs agree with Defendants’ contention (*e.g.*, “exceeds  
13 constitutional minimum,” “constitutionally required, but no violation,” “constitutionally  
14 required, but isolated incident that does not constitute current and ongoing violation”);

15       4. A description of necessary discovery, including an initial identification of  
16 subject areas likely to be relevant to determination of constitutional violations (*e.g.*,  
17 access to the court, religious expression, medical services, physical exercise, safety), the  
18 number and types of experts needed by each side, terms for permitting Plaintiffs’ experts  
19 opportunity to inspect jail conditions and interview pretrial detainees, and whether the  
20 parties will need to depose experts, bearing in mind that any discovery will be conducted  
21 in time for the August 12, 2008 hearing;

22       5. A stipulation and proposed protective order, if needed;

23       6. The estimated amount of time needed for the August 12, 2008 evidentiary  
24 hearing;

25       7. Proposed specific dates for completion of discovery and Rule 26(a)(3)  
26 disclosure with adequate time to exchange exhibits and drafts of the Proposed Final Pre-  
27 Hearing Order by July 28, 2008, in preparation for the Final Pre-Hearing Conference on  
28 August 4, 2008, at 1:30 p.m.; and

1       8. Any other matter that will aid the court and parties in resolving this case  
2 promptly.

3           The parties shall jointly file the Case Management Report with the Clerk no later  
4 than **May 15, 2008**.

5           **B. Final Pre-hearing Conference and Proposed Final Pre-Hearing Order**

6           The Final Pre-Hearing Conference will be set for **August 4, 2008, at 1:30 p.m.**  
7 Trial counsel who will be responsible for representing each party at the evidentiary  
8 hearing shall attend the Final Pre-Hearing Conference. The parties jointly shall prepare a  
9 Proposed Final Pre-Hearing Order and shall lodge it with the court no later than **4:00**  
10 **p.m. on July 30, 2008**. The parties shall submit a copy of the Proposed Final Pre-  
11 Hearing Order to the court in WordPerfect® 9.0 or higher (or compatible) format by  
12 email to [Wake\\_Chambers@azd.uscourts.gov](mailto:Wake_Chambers@azd.uscourts.gov).

13           The Proposed Final Pre-Hearing Order shall include the information prescribed in  
14 the Proposed Final Pretrial Order for Bench Trial form found at [www.azd.uscourts.gov](http://www.azd.uscourts.gov)  
15 under Judges & Courtrooms/Orders, Forms and Procedures/Judge Wake. Information  
16 shall not be set forth in the form of a question, but shall be presented in concise narrative  
17 statements.

18           Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c), the court will not allow the parties to offer any  
19 exhibit, witness, or other evidence that was not disclosed in accordance with the  
20 provisions of this Order and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and listed in the  
21 Proposed Final Pre-Hearing Order, except to prevent manifest injustice.

22           The parties shall exchange drafts of the Proposed Final Pre-Hearing Order no later  
23 than **July 28, 2008**. The parties shall (a) meet in person and exchange copies of all  
24 exhibits to be used at the evidentiary hearing no later than **July 28, 2008**, and (b)  
25 eliminate any duplicate exhibits while meeting to exchange exhibits. Defendants shall  
26 have the burden of initiating communications concerning the Proposed Final Pre-Hearing  
27 Order. Any exhibit not exchanged at this meeting shall be precluded at the evidentiary  
28 hearing.

1       Each party shall lodge proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law with the  
2 Proposed Final Pre-Hearing Order no later than **July 28, 2008**. The proposed findings of  
3 fact and conclusions of law shall also be submitted in WordPerfect® 9.0 or higher (or  
4 compatible) format by email to [Wake\\_Chambers@azd.uscourts.gov](mailto:Wake_Chambers@azd.uscourts.gov).

5

6           IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Motion to Expedite Consideration of Motion  
7 for Appointment of Class Counsel and Consideration of All Pending Motions (doc.  
8 #1213) is denied.

9           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion for Prior Notice and Other  
10 Procedural Safeguards in the Event of a Court Viewing of the Maricopa County Jail  
11 Premises (doc. #1214) is denied.

12           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Strike (doc. #1224) is  
13 granted.

14           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion to Refer Discovery Matters to  
15 Magistrate Judge (doc. #1184) is denied.

16           IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Omnibus Motion (doc. #1142) is  
17 granted in part and denied in part as follows:

- 18           1. Defendants bear the burden of proof on their motion to terminate prospective  
19           relief provided in the Amended Judgment.
- 20           2. The motion to terminate will be decided based on jail conditions during the  
21           period of July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008.
- 22           3. An evidentiary hearing on the motion to terminate is set for August 12, 2008,  
23           which will not resume the 2003-2004 evidentiary hearing.
- 24           4. The request for appointment of Rule 706 experts is denied.
- 25           5. Plaintiffs' experts will be permitted to inspect Maricopa County Jail facilities  
26           but only as provided by agreement of the parties or further order.
- 27           6. The discovery period will be concluded in time for the August 12, 2008  
28           evidentiary hearing.

1       7. Plaintiffs' motion to compel within their Omnibus Motion is denied without  
2       prejudice.

3       IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Production of  
4       Documents (doc. #1165), Motion for Sanctions Against Defendants and Their Counsel  
5       (doc. #1178), Motion to Compel Supplemental Responses to First Request for Production  
6       of Document (doc. #1181), and Motion for Oral Argument on Motion to Compel (doc.  
7       #1179) are denied without prejudice.

8       IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Requests for Status Conference  
9       (docs. ##1180, #1237) are granted.

10      IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are to meet and confer as described  
11     above no later than **May 12, 2008**, and shall exchange their written proposals for the Case  
12     Management Report at least two business days before meeting.

13      IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are to file a Case Management  
14     Report no later than **May 15, 2008**.

15      IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a Case Management Conference be held on  
16     **May 19, 2008, at 3:00 p.m.**

17      IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall exchange drafts of the Proposed  
18     Final Pre-Hearing Order by **July 28, 2008**, and shall jointly prepare a Proposed Final Pre-  
19     Hearing Order and lodge it with the court no later than **4:00 p.m. on July 30, 2008**.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a Final Pre-Hearing Conference be held on  
2 **August 4, 2008 at 1:30 p.m.**

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the evidentiary hearing on Defendants' motion  
4 to terminate the Amended Judgment be held on **August 12, 2008 at 9:00 a.m..**

5

6

7 DATED this 24<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2008.

8

9



10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 Neil V. Wake  
United States District Judge

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28